

Although the sponsors of "Uniting for Peace" were able to incorporate at least the sense of a large number of amendments suggested during the debate, there were certain proposals which were considered to be more suitable for adoption in the form of separate resolutions. Consequently, in addition to an annex containing revisions in the Assembly's Rules of Procedure in accordance with the various provisions of the resolution, two further resolutions were adopted. The first of these, concerning the application of Articles 43 and 45, 46 and 47 of the Charter, has already been mentioned. It was passed by a large majority after an amendment had been added to the effect that its acceptance would not in any way prejudice the Assembly's action under the "Uniting for Peace" provisions. The second independent resolution, which was unanimously adopted, recommended that the five permanent members of the Security Council should meet and discuss, collectively or otherwise, all problems relevant to the maintenance of peace; and that they should advise the other member states on the result of their consultations.

Following the Assembly's adoption of the resolution discussed above, the Political Committee debated two proposals submitted by the Yugoslav Delegation. The first, entitled "duties of states in the event of the outbreak of hostilities", was introduced by Mr. Kardelj, the Yugoslav Foreign Minister, who pointed out that there was a need to perfect, enlarge and broaden existing legal machinery on which the United Nations could base its efforts to prevent acts of aggression. The essential provisions of the resolution were, in brief, that within twenty-four hours after an outbreak of aggression each party should announce its willingness to cease fire and to withdraw its armed forces; that each party should, at midnight on the day of such an announcement, put the cease-fire order into effect and begin the withdrawal of its forces; and that any state which failed to abide by these provisions should be considered the aggressor, and would assume responsibility for prolonging the war.

The majority of delegations spoke in favour of the purposes of this proposal, but serious misgivings were expressed with regard to its various provisions. In the view of many delegations an aggressor was unlikely to be deterred by the resolution since an excuse for disregarding it could always be discovered. For this reason the proposal might work to the disadvantage of a victim of aggression which complied with it in good faith. Moreover, it was the consensus of the majority that to set up automatic criteria for determining an aggressor would be dangerous, and that no definition of aggression should be attempted without a full examination of all its implications. Accordingly, the agreement of the Yugoslav Delegation was obtained to a modified version of its own resolution. The final text is so phrased as to protect the interests of a state which complies with the recommendations, and to assure it of reasonable freedom of action. A clear reference is made to the rights of self-defence recognized by the Charter; those engaged in hostilities are to announce, within twenty-four hours after the outbreak of armed conflict, their readiness for a simultaneous cease-fire on terms agreed by the parties or under conditions laid down by the United Nations.